



The Chronicle Workshop - a method for to enhance and explore innovative processes in project based organisations

Greß, Sara; Ipsen, Christine

Published in:
International Conference on Organizational Learning, 2010

Publication date:
2010

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Greß, S., & Ipsen, C. (2010). The Chronicle Workshop - a method for to enhance and explore innovative processes in project based organisations. In *International Conference on Organizational Learning, 2010*
<http://www.cba.neu.edu/olkc2010/>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

The Chronicle Workshop

– A method to explore and enhance innovative processes in project-based organizations

Sara Grex¹

Assistant Professor, DTU Management Engineering,
Produktionstorvet, Building 424
Technical University of Denmark
DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby
sarg@man.dtu.dk

Christine Ipsen

Assistant Professor, DTU Management Engineering,
Produktionstorvet, Building 424
Technical University of Denmark
DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby
chip@man.dtu.dk

Keywords: Project-based organizations, innovation, Chronicle Workshop

Abstract

Recent studies on how management of innovation in project-based firms is put into practice have raised doubt about whether the project-based organization provides a supportive frame for innovation or not. A single case study using the Chronicle Workshop in a knowledge intensive company shows that by focusing on important events in the project, breakdowns in the project and work process can be revealed. The chronicle workshop can thus be regarded to be both a frame for understanding problems in the management and organization of work and an option for improving products and work processes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Globalization and the transformation from an industrial society towards a knowledge society are both trends that challenge today's businesses. They are being met with an increased demand for innovation, renewal and flexibility in order to stay competitive, and many companies respond by organizing their corporate activities in projects, implementing project-organizations and training staff within project-management.

According to general organizational theory, the project-based organization is considered the best way of organizing a company in order to promote innovation and innovative activities (Mintzberg 1983, Morgan 1997). Flexibility, low hierarchical systems and informal contact and communication between managers and employees are among the elements that are positively emphasized in this

¹ Sara Grex, Assistant Professor, DTU Management Engineering, Technical University of Denmark. DK-Kgs. Lyngby, +45-45256016, sarg@man.dtu.dk

organic structure. However, recent studies of how management of innovation in project-based firms is put into practice have raised doubt about whether the project-based organization provides a supportive frame for innovation or not. (Keegan, Turner 2002)

This doubt is raised as studies show that innovation is stifled even though work is organized as described above. The cause for this is likely to be the extended use of planning and control systems. According to the recommendations from existing literature, firms should de-emphasize planning and control in order to be innovative, but several/few studies show that project-based firms do the opposite. A reason for this is found in a mechanistic attitude towards control and management instead of an organically oriented management attitude loosening up on the control elements. (Keegan, Turner 2002)

The description above forms the background of a study which with the objective *to identify organizational options for supporting innovation in project based organizations and how the organization and innovative processes can be developed by using a story-telling method.*

This was reformulated into several research questions where two of them will be addressed in this paper:

1. What are the barriers for innovation in project-based organizations
2. How can the Chronicle Workshop support enhancement of innovative processes in project-based organizations?

The term barrier is to be understood as organizational barriers in relation to performing ones tasks and work. In this study the barriers are identified by looking at breakdowns in the work process.

In terms of enhancement, focus is on how a company can learn more about the challenges of organizing innovative processes in project-based organizations and the possibilities for developing organisational forms that supports the innovative work process.

The Chronicle Workshop (CW) (Limborg, Hans 2010, Hagedorn-Rasmussen, Mac 2007) was chosen as it provides a frame for a process study of the work. Instead of live studies or observations or interviews the CW was used as it provides rich data, quickly and provides a frame for a collective description of the process.

2. PROJECT-BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND INNOVATION

Two fields of interest, project-based organizations and innovation, constitutes the scope for this study and is described below. This is followed by a discussion on the barriers to innovation work in project-based organizations. Lastly, the characteristics of the Chronicle Workshop as a model will be outlined.

2.1. Project-based organizations

The concept project-based organizations can be characterized by outlining the form of the organizations and how it has developed. Based on Mintzbergs Adhocracy (Mintzberg 1983) focus is

brought on some of the issues and dilemmas which are related to project organization as an organizational principle.

The project organization can be seen as the alternative to the industrial society and the ways activities were organized in terms of hierarchies, mass production and standardization. From that perspective the project organization was “born” as a frame for creating change, innovation and renewal and was seen as an alternative to mass production and traditional hierarchies and management (Greix 2010). However, it is still a way of organizing which is shaped by the understanding and ideals in the industrial society and project management is thus also reflected by these ideals (Christensen, Kreiner 1991).

One way of managing projects is by using project management. Project management does not only apply to project based organizations. Project management is understood to be best suited for problems and projects with a clear goal and in innovation projects that is seldom the case, or at least the goals are changing during the process (Van de Ven et al. 1999). As a frame for work organizations, project management concepts are mostly concerned with fulfilling a task within limits of time, scope and budget, planning its implementation and controlling how it is implemented (Andersen O.S., Ahrengot N. & Olssen J.R. 2003, Andersen, Grude & Haug 2004, PMI 2004). Often Project Management has been criticized by the literature for being too instrumental, too mechanistic, for lacking leadership (Christensen, Kreiner 1991, Blomberg 2003, Söderlund 2004), for not being sensitive enough to the work processes it is organizing (Greix, Møller 2006).

Today it can be established that the project organization is not just a framework for development and innovation it is also a flexible model for production, which is aiming at replacing the traditional handling of cases. Projects are no longer just innovative but can also be understood to be routine project. The latter is about delivering the same performance in adapted form to the different customer's situation and need for example consulting, expert advice and IT. Projects and project organization has therefore become a way of working and a business model just as much as being a way of organizing. In this study focus is on companies which are project based and focused on development, innovation and renewal, in practice research and development departments, innovation departments and business development.

As mentioned above project organization has its origin in the industrial society and was originally a suitable way of organizing activities as it fitted the challenges facing the companies. Going through the literature on project organizing, project management and project-based organizations, raises the question whether it is a suitable way of organizing activities and tasks in the knowledge society. Mintzberg (Mintzberg 1983) points at three potential traps which are related to organizing activities around projects:

1. The ambiguities of the project organization (unclear tasks, unclear roles etc) and the human reaction here to
2. Its inefficiencies (in the bureaucratic understanding of efficiency) due to many meetings and uneven workflow
3. Built-in tendency to bureaucratize as a way of dealing with both ambiguities and inefficiency

These traps points to an inherent dilemma in project organizing between (bureaucratic) efficiency and innovation and renewal. This dilemma is also addressed by Ipsen (Ipsen 2007). Project management can be seen as the solution to this dilemma or a way of handling these traps besides as a way of organizing and managing work. But it is still an open question whether project management is (still) the right solution for organizing and managing innovation work.

2.2 Innovation and innovation work

One of the pioneers of innovation literature, Schumpeter, defines innovation as “an effort of one or more individuals to create economic profit through a qualitative change” (Darsø 2001). In this understanding innovation can both be an individual and a collective activity, and the innovation outcome of this effort can be different things. Innovation can be a new product, a new service, it can be a new process (ex. organizational, production or business) or a new form of organization, or way of managing or marketing etc.(Drucker 1985).

In this work we see innovation as many different outcomes, and we have our attention on the collective activity as we are looking at organizational approaches to support the innovative work process.

Given the extended literature on innovation not much research has looked into the work process of innovation and there is only little knowledge on the content of innovative work and how these work processes can be organized. Therefore we would like to put emphasis on the part of Schumpeter’s definition that has not been in focus, that is to say *the effort*, and one can ask: what is the qualitative nature of this effort that leads to economic profit? In the following we will try to identify a set of criteria for an innovation work process concept.

In the attempt to get a better understanding of the innovation work processes we have looked into the innovation process literature and tried to reveal some of the more or less implicit descriptions of innovation work.

Several describe the innovation process as turbulent, uncertain, and difficult to control and a process that cannot be described in linear terms (Herlau, Tetzschner 2001, Van de Ven 1986, Kanter 1998). To this Drucker (Drucker 1985) add a description of innovation as a systematic process of searching for incongruities in the environment. In the framework of Herlau and Tetzschner (Herlau, Tetzschner 2001) the innovation process is separated into to two distinct phases: the preject- and the project phase. The latter phase is the goal fulfilling, implementing phase focusing on managing towards the goal. The preject phase is prior to the project phase and is a goal searching and goal setting phase focused on gathering information, scanning for possibilities and managing this process. In relation to this Kanter (Kanter 1998) argues for four major innovation tasks: Idea generation, coalition building (getting support for the idea), idea realisation (elaboration of idea into model, plan, product etc.) and diffusion (spreading of the model). Both the process perspective and task perspective give us insight on a general level but it does not reveal the actual content of the work processes.

Innovation can also be seen as the result of a broad range of activities and processes. Below is listed some of the many activities the literature is suggesting and talking about (Drucker 1985, Kanter 1998, Kelly 2001, Nonaka, Takeuchi 1995):

- Studies of users, technology, needs etc.
- Knowledge and data gathering (e.g. user data, customer data, market data, technical data etc.),
- Analysis of data and knowledge and creation of new knowledge
- Experiments, trials and pilots
- Tests and prototyping
- Visualising and simulation
- Decision making

More activities could be mentioned and the list is not to be considered exhaustive. The point is merely to illustrate the richness and variety of activities being part of the innovation work process. As mentioned earlier it is commonly argued that the innovation process is a non-linear work process. The chain of activities in the work process can merely be described as a process of iteration, trial and error where it and some would even characterise it as more or less emergent (Christensen, Kreiner 1991, Darsø 2001). Thus, the activities listed above, does not occur or take place in a certain sequence, but occur more disorganized in relation to what is required in the situation and task at hand.

The innovation process is characterised by being cross disciplinary and involving people from different departments in the company and with different background (Drejer 2001). Both in relation to the overall process and task and to the different activities the innovation process involves different kind of knowledge, competencies, and experiences.

The actual work processes and work practice are situated and derive, evolve and are shaped in the specific context it takes place (Brown, Duguid 1991, Flyvbjerg 2001). The contextual conditions differ from firm to firm, from innovation type to innovation type and maybe even from project to project as the tasks are different and we propose that the innovation work and innovation work process are understood in relation to the specific context they are deriving from.

In view of the three identified perspectives we propose that innovation work process is understood as non-linear, heterogeneous, and situated in a specific context. Further we see work processes as embedded in an organization of structures (procedures, rules, hierarchy, roles etc.), people (competencies, interests, etc.), tools, techniques and methods, and tasks and activities. For the innovation work process the ideal organization of work is both constraining and enabling the work processes by bringing the process ahead in a given direction and still creating room for creativity and changeability (Kelly 2001).

2.3 Barriers to innovation work in project-based organizations

A part of the background for this study was Keegan and Turners article (2000) on innovation in project-based organizations. In their survey, they point to different barriers for innovation. One barrier could be the strong focus on project management, control and evaluation which impedes innovation. The survey also shows that the studied companies basically see innovation as risky, expensive and dangerous. Consequently, the authors conclude that the conception of good management in project-based organizations still has a stronger focus on mechanistic management principles than on managerial principles which focuses on organic principles. It is thus an efficiency consideration which constitutes a barrier for innovation.

Christensen and Kreiner (Christensen, Kreiner 1991) have a similar point of view and add that the barriers with regard to innovation are related to the lack of willingness to take risks. When it comes to project management it is especially the managerial style and the underlying management understanding which are pointed out to create a barrier. It comes in the shape of tight management and control of the activities. As the formal hierarchies flattens and the structures become more fluid having less influence on the how things are dealt with in the organizations, the processes become more important. It is thus of great relevance how these are run, planned and managed in relation to the tasks and how these support the innovation.

The literature on project-based work and project management embraces potential barriers for innovation in a managerial terminology but an understanding from a process perspective is lacking (Greix 2010). Therefore there is a need to study the processes which support innovation in project-based organizations in order to stay competitive.

Innovation is a task and work process entirely different from operations and even within the different kind of innovations (product, service, process etc.) the task and work processes differs. To support the innovation work process, the organization of work must use the work process to be supported as a starting point. Based on the above we propose there is a need for an organization form that enables both structure to bring the process ahead and creates the freedom for creativity and experiments and thus balance the structural and emergent processes of innovation work. It must also enhance the organizational competence to act in the given context and work process by improving organizational awareness to the work process and the ability to reflect upon it. In such way the organization must be able to organize in relation to the changing work processes and what they require.

2.4 The Chronicle Workshop method

The Chronicle Workshop (CW) is a research method for gaining insight in an organizations history, events, conflicts and other important elements in the development of an organization (Hagedorn-Rasmussen & Mac, 2007). The method establishes a process of creating knowledge, based on the experience of an organization, and it gives a basis for action.

CW is still a method under development and it is only vaguely described (Hagedorn-Rasmussen, Mac 2007). In a Danish context it has mainly been used in relation to occupational health and safety issues. Existing experience with the method has had a clear aim for change whereas the potential of the method for data collection purposes has been less in focus. In this paper both the effect of using the method on the organization that is studied as well as the methods possibilities as research method is considered.

The purpose of the workshop is that the participants create a story around a specific theme and sometimes supports changes to be made based on the common experience and knowledge production. The workshop has two phases. In the first phase the story is told and in the second the story is processed by the participants. For the story telling phase a timeline is needed, typically for a period of 10-15 years when the purpose is to tell the story of an organization, but for telling project stories the time frame is often much shorter. In this case it was just two years. The timeline is stuck on the wall and the participants are seated in a half circle in front of the wall. The Chronicle Workshop is a visual method, where the story is visualized on the wall by coloured pieces of carton as a central element.

The storytelling phase happens in three rounds:

Round 1: Important events in the project

Round 2: Important persons in the project

Round 3: Important problems, dilemmas, challenges and conflicts in the project

Each round has carton of its own colour and separately each member write down his or hers contributions on the carton and stick it to wall to fill out the timeline and create the story.

After the three rounds the story is told and the participants can start working with the picture they have drawn. First step in this process is to divide the story in chapters and give them a headline. Headlines with a dramatic or picturesque touch are very well working. Next step is to analyse and interpret the story and for this purpose the SWOT² analysis is a good tool to support this process. Depending on the number of participants and the time frame for the workshop this can be done in one or several groups, where it is possible to change between group work and plenum to bring forward the diversity in the different interpretations.

To a researcher the Chronicle Workshop is a tool that is especially helpful in situations where you need to generate lots of data on an organization in short time which can otherwise be a very time consuming process. In this case the methodology was used as a replacement for studying an innovation project in real time and had a positive outcome. It both provided interesting data as well as it brought along new experiences with the methodology.

3. METHODOLOGY

This paper is based on a Danish study carried out in cooperation with several knowledge-intensive companies in Denmark. One of the basic premises in the study has been to understand and examine

² Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

the possibilities to enhance and support innovative processes in project-based organisations (Grex 2010).

It is based on a qualitative research methodology. (Collis, Hussey 2003) The qualitative approach was chosen in order to gain increased insight in how project actors understand and experience their world and their life as participants in processes of project management and innovation processes. The qualitative approach and the dialogue are very suitable for this purpose (Kvale 1997).

In the first part a multiple case study in four unrelated companies was carried out based on qualitative interviews (Yin 1989). The respondents were thus asked about the innovative work processes which challenges they experienced in their work and what initiatives were usually taken to overcome them.

The case studies resulted in several interesting findings in relation to the research question. However, it also showed the limits of the qualitative interview method. Using the interview method made it evident that it was difficult for the informants to articulate their problems and dilemmas in relation to project management and innovation work. From a researchers point of view the interview method did not support an optimal frame for grasping the actual work process as the informants terminology of project management created a communicative barrier for articulating the actual tasks and activities in the work process.

In order to overcome these gaps the second empirical part was established and the Chronicle Workshop was chosen (Limborg, Hans 2010, Hagedorn-Rasmussen, Mac 2007). Below it will be described how the CW method was adjusted and applied in this case.

The workshop had the aim to identify a series of possible breakdowns in the process and flow of the project and explicate the corporate tacit knowledge on problems, their causes and possible solutions. Examples of possible breakdowns could be obstacles or interruptions to the work process. Looking at process breakdowns as an analytical strategy comes from a framework called Contextual Design (CD) (Beyer, Holtzblatt 1998). This is a framework for both studying work and work organization and for developing and redesigning work organizations and work practices. It derives from system design tradition and is primarily written for IT and software projects. However the method and its principles have inspired us with a way of looking closer at the innovation work, the work processes and how it can be supported. The user is a very central actor in CD and the method is focused on designing new systems with regard to the users and their daily practice and context.

Methodologically it was an experiment as the Chronicle Workshop originally was developed for telling stories with a time frame of 10-15 years. In this case study the chronicle workshop was used in a project context with a much smaller time frame (18-24 months) and with a lower number of participants.

The assumption behind this research activity is that it creates a collective room for reflection where tacit knowledge can be articulated and form the basis for a learning process. A participatory

workshop would thus form an adequate framework for a double-loop reflection (Argyris, Schön 1996) if the mismatch between the actual practice and the espoused theory was to be highlighted. At the same time a space would be created for development of new alternative solutions. The workshop would also at the same time be a tangible example of a collective “Ba” (Nonaka, Toyama & Konno 2000) creating a room for understanding and a platform for developing alternative practices in order to solve the recognised issues and problems. Finally, it was the aim to show that the participants own reflections could provide the basis for alternative ideas for new processes and organisational changes compared with the present practice.

A reflective workshop in practice the Chronicle Workshop was thus conducted where several employees and managers were asked to participate. The outcome of the Chronicle workshop was empirical data on different levels. On a tangible level it gave a story line of the project flow, its breakdowns the possibility of viewing the project process in a new light. On an abstract level it provides a framework for exploring and enhancing innovation in project-based organizations.

The case: The Chronicle Workshop in a project-based organization

In the case at hand the purpose of the workshop was to get the participants to tell the story of an innovation project to gain insight on the difficulties in the work process as they were experienced by the project members. The workshop theme was communication and knowledge transfer. The theme was chosen by the project manager as the group had experienced difficulties in this area and she had a feeling improvements were needed.

For preparation to the workshop, the project manager was interviewed both to gain knowledge on the project practice in the company and to learn more about the innovative project. In short the scope of the innovation project was to develop a new instrument concept to be used in the food industry. The new instrument is smaller than the company’s other instruments and it is combined with a new service concept that will make the instrument both cheaper and easier to operate and maintain for the customer. With this new instrument it will be possible for the costumer to run tests on his food samples on his own production site instead of sending them off to a remote lab.

In the case five persons all male engineers participated in the workshop. It lasted for three hours and due to the limited time most of it was spent on telling the project story and only half an hour was spent on working with it. This part was mainly spent on creating headlines and discussing lessons learned from the project and the workshop. Analysis and interpretation of the project process was made by the researcher and afterwards presented and discussed with the project manager. Unfortunately it was not possible for the rest of the workshop members to participate in this meeting due to lack of time.

Based on the collective reflections several organisational important breakdowns and events were identified. The process thus revealed issues that worked well, others that didn’t and issues which needed to be addressed in relation to support innovation in the organization. Two of these issues will be addressed in this paper. Besides, the Chronicle Workshop resulted in some issues on a more general level in relation to innovation in project-based organisations which will be presented below.

4. RESULTS

The method puts attention to events and processes in the project that was both successful and difficult. The application of the Chronicle Workshop in this case reveals several problems in the organization of work in the project.

4.1. Practical implications for innovation

On a practical level the Chronicle Workshop contributes in different ways to explore and enhance the innovation in the participating companies. First of all, the workshop offers an opportunity for a collective realization of the impact of events on the project and the innovation. In the daily activities innovative processes can be difficult to observe due to its immaterial character. (Alvesson 1995) Using the CW thus provides a beneficial tool to focus on the activities and make the decisions, activities and problems more specific.

Secondly, it provides the individuals for example the project manager with the opportunity to see the project in a new perspective as it provides a structured frame for evaluation of the project. The outcome could be a deeper understanding of the dynamics in the process. It thus becomes easier to communicate the results, connections, points of interest to the rest of the organization as well as the project team. The CW can as a result be viewed to constitute a room for systematic evaluation of the process which can reveal which organizational initiatives worked and contributed positively to the forward process. An example of these initiatives is the “The journey abroad” which will be highlighted below.

Finally the CW also points out what went wrong during the project, which initiatives were taken accordingly and what can be used onwards and what not. The second example which will be described in this paper is about knowledge sharing. The workshop made it clear that handing over knowledge in a portfolio did not support the process which was necessary to enhance innovation in the project. The example of knowledge sharing will be described below.

4.1.1 Example 1: Flow – The journey abroad

In the beginning of the project the group went for a two-week journey abroad to do a preliminary test of the technology at different customer sites. For the group this journey was important in several ways. First of all they met the users of their products for the first time, secondly the technology proved it worked and was possible to use as the engineers imagined. And thirdly the journey developed the group as a team. They developed trust for one another and a very open and outspoken way of communication, which enabled them to both come forward with their different interest and handle the conflicts they had later on in the project process. It was the first time the company had tried to send the engineers out to meet the customers and for the group it was experienced with great excitement and gave a lot of energy for the rest of the time.

The customer meeting is an example of a certain way of organizing a specific work process in the innovation project. It can be seen as a way of organizing activities which supports the employees in

their knowledge creation and sharing about the customers and the needs that the customers have. Meeting the customers is also an activity which supports the social development of the group and conflict management instead of suppressing important and problematic issues.

4.1.2 Example 2: Breakdown – knowledge sharing across teams

At the end of the project period described the development team had the practice to hand over the project to the next group (the construction development team). The company procedure for handing over a project was that the development team gathered all knowledge and documentation on the product in a file and specified the concept for the constructors to implement it. The handover was supposed to be done in writing with written questions and answers to “support” the file. However, in the CW-story the handover stands out as an event where the work process completely breaks down. The group receiving the file does not understand the documents and have lots of questions for the development team. The development team says on the other hand that they cannot imagine that the receiving team is not able to understand the project and the documents. The result of the difference of opinions was that everybody was very frustrated and disappointed and the project got delayed by several months.

The experience from this event was that the project file was not sufficient to support the handover process and it lacked a supporting organization, as no knowledge could be shared between the two teams in this way. In order to overcome this breakdown the two groups arranged seminars and workshops as well as small meetings between specialists from the two teams. This enabled them to share knowledge by reestablishing a flow in the work process. In the end this event turned into something positive and a successful experience to the groups as they both overcame the breakdown and they learned a lot from the experience.

This is an example of how the work process breaks down as it is not well supported organizationally. It consequently makes it impossible for the team members to fulfill their tasks. It also shows how the participants develop ways of organizing suited for the situations and deriving from their experiences. Finally, it is clear that in order to make tacit knowledge explicit and useful to others, the project team members need to identify and specify their actual working process in order to ensure that the performed activities in this case knowledge transfer support the needed output and expected performance.

4.2 The Chronicle Workshop reveals new organizational processes

Using the chronicle Workshop also reveals various organizational processes as an inherent part of innovation. Examples of these are:

- *Innovation is a knowledge creating process.* The project group creates new knowledge, knowledge is internalized and knowledge become tacit to the group and to the rest of the organisation
- *Innovation is political.* Innovation is related to conflicts og interest (tech. solutions), negotiations, protectionism
- *Innovation is posing changes on the rest of the organisation.* Innovation changes products, customers, internal work processes and in the end innovation can change the

power balance in the organization. Innovations projects thus initiate internal change processes.

Both project participants and the project manager were unaware of these processes and where therefore not able to neither understand the problems the project faced both internally but also in relation to the rest of the organization and nor to handle them effectively. In this case it is shown that project management is too narrow to manage and organize this kind of work. And also it is an example of how the project management terminology shades to see the actual nature of innovation work and the processes inherent in the work.

Based on the Chronicle workshop, the empirical research show that innovation and innovation work is a knowledge creating process and that it is a process creating organizational changes inside the organization. It also shows that these processes are difficult for the companies to handle. This brings us to the conclusion in the project that innovation projects cannot be managed by project management alone.

4.3 Methodological results

Based on the study it is evident that the Chronicle Workshop provides a set of opportunities to the researchers. First of all, the CW enables the researcher to get closer to the process and “behind” the terminology of project management and work by focusing on the story and the flow of the innovative project. One of the conclusions from the first part of the study was that the project management terminology is dominating the rhetoric of the respondents. It is therefore difficult to get an actual understanding of the process, but by using the CW it provides the researcher with a new tool to get a more detailed and thorough understanding of the process.

Secondly, it gives the researcher the possibility to spar with the respondents which is of key importance in a participatory research project as it enables the researcher to get access to richer data in this case the process. It thus reveals the working process in on consecutive flow and where there are breakdowns in the process. In a learning process it provides input and understandings of what creates the flows and the breakdowns.

The CW method has similarities with other workshop methods (e.g. The Future Workshop) or group interviews (e.g. focus groups etc.) and can be characterized as a participatory action research method. The strength in the method lies in its focus on the collective and organizational aspect of the organization with a special interest in the collective process of experience. Thus, using the method gives insight to the non-official story of the organizations as it has been discovered and learned by the members of the organization (Hagedorn-Rasmussen, Mac 2007). In the case study, the CW brings us knowledge on the problems and what went well in a specific project process and on what was valued by the project members and what they had done to overcome the problems in the process. This points to another strength in the method; its aim for change. Revealing the process contributes to bring awareness to how the organization can be improved. In addition the case shows that the method has a potential as a tool for systematic evaluation of the work process, which enables the organization to improve or change the organization of work in order to support the work

process better. In that sense the method is not only a research method it can also be used by organizations as part of their project and evaluation practice.

6. CONCLUSION

The results from the chronicle workshop imply that by focusing on important events in the project, it can reveal breakdowns in the project and work process. Both the breakdowns and important events in the project point at opportunities for improvements of the work processes and a better understanding of managing the innovation process. Overall the method can make tacit knowledge explicit on what causes the problems and the implications for the innovation process.

It has also become evident that it is a method that demonstrates its potential for creating an organizational room for reflection, where tacit knowledge can be explicated and support learning and creativity in the organization. A chronicle workshop can thus provide a platform for improvement of both processes and products which is crucial in supporting innovation.

The chronicle workshop can thus be regarded to be both a frame for understanding problems in the management and organization of work and an option for improving products and work processes.

REFERENCE LIST

- Alvesson, M. 1995, *Management of Knowledge-Intensive Companies*, Oxford University Press edn, .
- Andersen O.S., Ahrengot N. & Olssen J.R. 2003, *Aktiv Projektledelse*, Børsens Forlag, København.
- Andersen, E.S., Grude, K. & Haug, T. 2004, *Goal Directed Project Management: effective techniques and strategies*, Kogan Page Ltd, London.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. 1996, *Organizational Learning II. Theory, Method and Practice*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Beyer, H. & Holtzblatt, K. 1998, *Contextual Design: Defining Customer-Centered Systems*, Academic Press, London.
- Blomberg, J. 2003, *Projektorganisationen - kritiske analyser av projektprat och praktik*, Liber Ekonomi, Malmö.
- Brown, J.S. & Duguid, P. 1991, "Organisational Learning and Communities-of-Practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation", *Organization Science*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 40-57.
- Christensen, S. & Kreiner, K. 1991, *Projektledelse i løstkoblede systemer*, Jurist- og økonomiforbundets Forlag.
- Collis, J. & Hussey, R. 2003, *Business research*, 2nd edn, Palgrave Macmillan.

- Darsø, L. 2001, *Innovation in the making*, Samfundslitteratur.
- Drejer, A. 2001, *Den innovative virksomhed. Innovationsledelse - hvorfor, hvordan og hvornår*, Børsens Forlag, København.
- Drucker, P.F. 1985, *Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Flyvbjerg, B. 2001, *Making Social Science Matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*, Cambridge University Press.
- Grex, S. 2010, *Arbejde, Innovation og Projekter. Organisering og udvikling af innovative processer i projektledede organisationer*.
- Grex, S. & Møller, N. 2006, "New ways of organizing innovation work", *World Congress of the International Ergonomics Association, Meeting Diversity in Ergonomics (IEA), 2006, Maastricht, Holland*.
- Hagedorn-Rasmussen, P. & Mac, A. 2007, "Historieværkstedets metode" in *Teknikker i samfundsvidenskaberne*, ed. P.B. Olsen, Roskilde Universitetsforlag, Frederiksberg, pp. 156-176.
- Herlau, H. & Tetzschner, H. 2001, *Fra jobtager til jobmager - model II*, Samfundslitteratur, Frederiksberg.
- Ipsen, C. 2007, *Vidensarbejderens særlige arbejdssituation og muligheder for forebyggelse af arbejdsrelateret stress i vidensarbejdet*, Institut for Produktion og Ledelse, DTU.
- Kanter, R.M. 1998, "When a Thousand Flowers Bloom: Structural, Collective, and Social Conditions for Innovation in Organization" in *Entrepreneurship. The social science view*, ed. Richard Swedberg, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 167-210.
- Keegan, A. & Turner, R. 2002, "The Management of Innovation in Project-Based Firms", *Long range planning*, vol. 35, pp. 367-388.
- Kelly, T. 2001, *The Art of Innovation*, Profile Books, London.
- Kvale, S. 1997, *Interview*, Hans Reitzels Forlag, København.
- Limborg, H.J. & Hans, H. 2010, "The Cronicle Workshop" in *Interactive Methods. Facilitation of change in organizations, communities and networks*, ed. L.B. Rasmussen, Polyteknisk Forlag, Lyngby.
- Mintzberg, H. 1983, "The Adhocracy" in *Structures in five* Prentice-Hall International ed, , pp. 253-281.
- Morgan, G. 1997, *Images of Organization*, Sage Publications.
- Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. 1995, *The Knowledge-Creating Company*, Oxford University Press, New York.

- Nonaka, I., Toyama, R. & Konno, N. 2000, *SECI, Ba and Leadership: a Unified Model of Dynamic Knowledge Creation*.
- PMI 2004, *A guide to the project management book of knowledge: PMBOK guide*, Project Management Institute, Pennsylvania.
- Søderlund, J. 2004, "On the broadening scope of the research on projects: a review and a model for analysis", *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 22, no. 8, pp. 655-667.
- Van de Ven, A.H. 1986, *Central Problems in the Management of Innovation*, Institute of Management Sciences.
- Van de Ven, A.H., Polley, D.E., Garud, R. & Vankataraman, S. 1999, *The Innovation Journey*, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford.
- Yin, R.K. 1989, *Case Study Research. Design and methods*, Sage Publications.